

## PROCEEDINGS AGAINST PETE LICAVOLI FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

FEBRUARY 21 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany S. Res. 79]

The Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce as created and authorized by the United State Senate by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, second session, caused to be issued a subpoena to Pete Licavoli of Grosse Pointe, Mich. The said subpoena directed Pete Licavoli to be and appear before the said committee forthwith, at room 900, Federal Housing Loan Bank Building, 101 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee and not to depart without leave of said committee. The date of issuance of the subpoena was the 12th day of January 1951. Attendance pursuant to said subpoena was had on February 8, 1951, at Detroit, Mich., in room 734, Federal Building, at which time the witness appeared. The subpoena served upon said Pete Licavoli is set forth as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

To PETE LICAVOLI, 1154 Balfour Road, Grosse Pointe, Mich., Greeting:

Pursuant to lawful authority, you are hereby commanded to appear before the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce of the Senate of the United States, on forthwith, 1951, at their committee room 900 Federal Housing Loan Bank Building, 101 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., then and there to testify what you may know relative to the subject matters under consideration by said committee, and bring with you:

1. All ledgers, vouchers, canceled checks, check stubs, bank deposit slips, bank statements, financial statements, notes, copies of tax returns, records of accounts receivable and payable and records of cash receipts and disbursements, for the period from January 1, 1940, to date.

2. All books, records, or other documents showing ownership of, or other holding or interest in any business, company, or enterprise, or in any property, real, personal, or intangible, for the period from January 1, 1950, to date.

3. All correspondence relating to the subject matter referred to in paragraph 2 hereof, for the period from January 1, 1940, to date.

Hereof fail not, as you will answer your default under the pains and penalties in such cases made and provided.

To ----- to serve and return.

Given under my hand, by order of the committee, this 12th day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-one.

ESTES KEFAUVER,

*Chairman, Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.*

The said subpoena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Kennedy Laurence, Deputy Superintendent, Detroit Police Department, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpoena. The return of the service by the said Kennedy Laurence, being endorsed thereon is set forth as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1951.

I made service of the within subpoena by showing the original and presenting the copy to the within-named Pete Licavoli, at 1300 Beaubien Street, Detroit, Mich., at 11:36 o'clock a. m., on the 13th day of January 1951.

KENNEDY LAURENCE,

*Deputy Superintendent, Detroit Police Department.*

The said Pete Licavoli, pursuant to said subpoena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee to give such testimony as required by virtue of Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, second session. Pete Licavoli having appeared as a witness and having been asked questions, which questions were pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, made answers as appeared in the records of the hearing on February 8, 1951, at room 734, Federal Building, Detroit, Mich., which record is annexed hereto and made a part hereof and designated "Annex I."

As a result of said Pete Licavoli's refusal to answer the questions pursuant to the said inquiry, as appears in the record annexed, consisting of pertinent excerpts from the testimony of that day, the committee was prevented from receiving testimony and evidence concerning the matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of said subpoena served upon this witness.

The committee was therefore deprived of answers to questions pursuant to the committee's inquiry propounded to Pete Licavoli pertinent to the subject matter which under Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, second session, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer questions as set forth in annex I is a violation of the subpoena under which the witness was directed to appear and answer pertinent questions to the subject under inquiry, and his persistent and illegal refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived the committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places this witness in contempt of the United States Senate.

The subcommittee hearing at which said witness refused to answer said questions was duly authorized by a resolution of the said committee on January 3, 1951, as set forth below:

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE**

*Resolved*, That the chairman of this committee be and hereby is authorized at his discretion to appoint one or more subcommittees of one or more Senators, of whom one member shall be a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and all other committee acts, to hold hearings at such time and places as the chairman might designate, in furtherance of the committee's investigation of organized crime, in the vicinities of the cities of Cleveland, Ohio, and Detroit, Mich.

In accordance with the resolution of January 3, 1951, the chairman, by letter dated February 3, 1951, as set forth below, designated Senator Herbert R. O'Connor as a subcommittee of one to swear witnesses and to hear testimony at Detroit, Mich., beginning February 8, 1951.

FEBRUARY 3, 1951.

Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONNOR,  
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR O'CONNOR: In accordance with the authority granted me by the committee under the resolution attached, I hereby name you as chairman of the subcommittee of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce to conduct hearings in Detroit, Mich., beginning February 8, 1951.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER, *Chairman.*

After reviewing the testimony and other facts as set forth herein, the committee adopted a resolution, as set forth below:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE  
COMMERCE

MINUTES OF A COMMITTEE MEETING, FEBRUARY 17, 1951

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., in room 457, Senate Office Building. There were present the chairman and Senators Tobey, Hunt, and O'Connor. Senator O'Connor presented to the committee the minutes of the committee meeting of February 8 and 9, 1951, together with a resolution made on January 3, 1951. The chairman stated to the committee that the chairman had designated a subcommittee to hear continued testimony in connection with organized crime in the city of Detroit, Mich., pursuant to the resolution of January 3, 1951, the subcommittee consisting of Senator O'Connor.

The chairman of the subcommittee then presented to the committee the minutes of said subcommittee meeting of February 8, 1951, held in room 734, Federal Building, Detroit, Mich.

The chairman of the subcommittee stated to the committee that the witness, Pete Licavoli, repeatedly, consistently, and arbitrarily had refused to answer questions put to him throughout counsel and chairman of the subcommittee's examination of said witness on February 8, 1951, and that his refusal therefore was improper and contemptuous.

The chairman of the subcommittee presented to the committee a draft report on the entire matter for the committee's consideration and the committee duly adopted the said report and instructed the chairman to present said report to the United States Senate.

Therefore, upon motion of Senator Hunt, duly seconded by Senator Tobey, it was duly resolved that the committee present to the United States Senate, for its immediate action, a resolution requiring the United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan to proceed against the said Pete Licavoli in the manner and form provided by law.

ANNEX I

ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ORGANIZED CRIME  
IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE,  
*Detroit, Mich., Thursday, February 8, 1951.*

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment. at 10 a. m., in Room 734, Federal Building, Senator O'Connor (chairman) presiding.

President: Senator Herbert R. O'Connor (chairman).

Also present: Rudolph Halley, chief counsel; John L. Burling, assistant counsel; Alfred M. Klein, assistant counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. I now call Pete Licavoli.

Do you swear the testimony you will give this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I do.

## TESTIMONY OF PETER LICAVOLI

The CHAIRMAN. What is your full name?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Peter Licavoli.

The CHAIRMAN. Peter Licavoli?

Mr. LICAVOLI. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your address?

Mr. LICAVOLI. 1154 Balfour.

The CHAIRMAN. 1154 Balfour?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you lived there?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Oh, about 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you live before that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. St. Louis.

The CHAIRMAN. How long did you live in St. Louis?

Mr. LICAVOLI. All my life.

The CHAIRMAN. You were born there?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In what business are you engaged?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer that question on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me in both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Licavoli, you were advised by counsel for the committee that the privilege as to self-incrimination does not apply to State offenses, and you may refuse to testify only if the testimony would have a tendency to incriminate you of a Federal offense. Do you understand that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Have you been consulting with counsel?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Now, furthermore, you understand that you may claim the privilege and you may refuse to answer on that ground only if in fact the answer if given would tend to incriminate you; that is to say that if you told the truth you would be admitting the crime. Do you understand that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. So that, in effect, you are saying you refuse to answer the question as to what your occupation is on the ground that it is a criminal occupation; do you understand that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't get that clear, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Perhaps I have gone a little too fast for you. If I ask you, is it raining, you cannot refuse to answer on the ground that it would tend to incriminate you because it would not.

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. You can only claim the privilege legally if in fact the answer if given would tend to incriminate you. Do you understand that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. That means that if you are rightfully claiming your privilege the answer to the question would tend to incriminate you.

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. In other words, if you tell us what your occupation is it would tend to incriminate you; is that right?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer that on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. BURLING. You refuse to answer whether or not you understand me on the ground that it would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. At this juncture we will recess for lunch, until 1:45, and you will return to the stand at that time.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken at 12:45 p. m., to reconvene at 1:45 p. m.)

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will be resumed.

We will call Mr. Pete Licavoli to the stand again.



TESTIMONY OF PETE LICAVOLI—Recalled

The CHAIRMAN. At the time we recessed for lunch, certain questions were being asked you, and I will now ask counsel to continue.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Licavoli, do you have a criminal record?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. BURLING. Let me see if we can get this straight. Do you refuse to answer whether you have been previously arrested, on the ground that it might incriminate you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Do you care to explain the ground? How could the fact that you had previously been arrested tend to incriminate you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know how, but I refuse to answer the question.

Mr. BURLING. You decline to give the committee any explanation as to why it would tend to incriminate you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. That is right.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask that the witness be ordered to answer the questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The chairman of the subcommittee orders you to answer that question.

Mr. LICAVOLI. It orders me to answer it? I refuse to answer any questions that tend to incriminate me, in violation of the State and Federal laws.

The CHAIRMAN. Next question.

Mr. BURLING. Were you arrested in 1922 for robbery?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer the question, on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me, under both Federal and State laws.

Mr. BURLING. How could it possibly tend to incriminate you, Mr. Licavoli, as to whether or not you were arrested for robbery in 1922? The statute of limitations is over long ago.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. BURLING. On what ground?

Mr. LICAVOLI. It may tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Even to explain it? Would that tend to incriminate you? Is that your position?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Pardon?

Mr. BURLING. Just explain to the committee how it could possibly tend to incriminate you to answer whether you had been arrested for robbery in 1922.

Mr. LICAVOLI. Well, I refuse to answer that, sir. It might incriminate me both under the State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. I think the question as to whether he was arrested is proper, and I respectfully ask that the witness be ordered to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee orders you to answer it.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Licavoli. Will you look at this photograph which I am handing you, and tell me whether you have any idea of who that person is?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer that, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Licavoli, this is a police photograph, Detroit Police Department, No. 30787, dated 6-1-50. It looks to me remarkably like the witness, and I ask that this and the attached police records be marked in evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be so marked.

(The document identified was thereupon received in evidence as exhibit 4, Witness Licavoli.)

The CHAIRMAN. While it is before you, you can avail yourself of its contents and propound any questions.

Mr. BURLING. I am going to read what purports to be your police record, and ask that you listen attentively, and if there is any arrest on here which you think does not relate to you, please let us know.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't think that is fair, sir. I am not on trial here.

Mr. BURLING. Would you prefer that we do it case by case?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't prefer. I refuse to answer all questions concerning me, because it may tend to incriminate me—

Mr. BURLING. It may not, sir.

Mr. LICAVOLI. In violation of State and Federal laws. I don't think that it is fair that you should read my record.

Mr. BURLING. All right. Police department, St. Louis, 9-5-22, robbery, discharged. Same police department, 1-19-26, robbery, discharged. Detroit, 9-8-27, armed robbery, discharged. 3-30-27, violation of Volstead Act, St. Louis, discharged by court. Police department, Detroit, 10-26-27, kidnaping.

Do you remember that?

(No response.)

Mr. BURLING. I said, do you remember that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, sir.

Mr. BURLING. I see. It might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. In other words, you might be incriminated of the crime of kidnaping if you answer?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer that, sir.

Mr. BURLING. You can't refuse to answer. The inference is unmistakable, if you refuse to answer on the charge of kidnaping in 1927, if you were guilty as charged.

Mr. LICAVOLI. Well, the record answers for itself, sir. Everything is on there. You've got the record, and it reads for itself, whatever it is. Why should I incriminate myself if I answer that question?

Mr. BURLING. Because you have no right, under the Constitution to refuse to answer that you were not guilty of kidnaping.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I have my constitutional—it is within my constitutional rights to refuse to answer, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Very well. The police department, Detroit, 1-8-28, violation of prohibition, discharged. 3-21-28, C. C. W.; fined \$200 and 90 days in the Detroit House of Correction. 7-19-28, murder. Did you commit the murder?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer.

Mr. BURLING. You think it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. It might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. BURLING. If you testified about this murder charge? The inference again is quite clear.

7-21-28, armed robbery, discharged. 4-29-29, kidnaping, discharged.

How about that? Do you have anything to say about that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. BURLING. You don't deny it?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer.

Mr. BURLING. Then, 5-12-29, investigation, disorderly person. Discharged. 9-26-29, investigation, discharged. These are all Detroit. 1-6-30, investigation. Discharged.

Toledo, 10-2-31, fugitive, turned over to Detroit police. Then received in Detroit at 10-5-31 on the charge of murder. You were found not guilty. Now, since you were found not guilty, you can't be incriminated with that. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it may tend to incriminate me in violation of State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Licavoli, once a jury has found you not guilty of murder, you cannot be tried again for it. Therefore, it would be impossible for you to be incriminated. Will you explain to us why you refuse to tell us about this murder charge?

Mr. LICAVOLI. That is past, 20 years or 25 years ago. Why should I talk about something that is already over with 25 years ago?

Mr. BURLING. Because you are being questioned.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer any questions in regards to any past histories.

Mr. BURLING. Will you please tell us all that you know about your arrest in Toledo and your being charged with murder and the acquittal of murder in 1931?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer on the ground it may tend to incriminate me in violation of the Federal and State laws.

Mr. BURLING. It seems to me that is a clearly proper question.

The CHAIRMAN. Just continue with the rest of the record so you can ask one general question.

Mr. BURLING. 12-3-31, conspiracy to violate the national prohibition law, no disposition given; 5-2-33, murder, discharged by the court; 4-22-35, investigating shooting, discharged on writ; 6-10-35, investigation, disorderly person and

armed robbery, discharged; 8-12-35, attempted extortion, discharged by the court; 11-11-35, A and B, \$100 or 90 days, Detroit House of Correction; 1-23-41, conspiracy, found not guilty; 10-10-41, investigation "r. a.", discharged; 12-30-42, reckless driving, discharged; 8-27-46, investigation, discharged; 6-1-50, investigation, no disposition given. I believe as to any matters prior to the running of the statute of limitations, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the witness has no privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Licavoli, with reference to those questions which have been asked of by counsel, the committee directs you to answer. What response do you make?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me in violation of both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. I ask that this brochure be marked and I offer it in evidence.

(The document identified was thereupon received in evidence as exhibit No. 4A, Witness Licavoli.)

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Chairman, I have a brochure describing what is called a "beautiful Grace Ranch nestled in the scenic Catalina foothills, 12 miles north-east of Tucson." Mr. Licavoli, will you look at this brochure and tell me what ranch is referred to?

Mr. LICAVOLI. That is mine.

Mr. BURLING. That is yours?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, it is.

Mr. BURLING. Known as the Grace Ranch?

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to see if this properly describes it?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I know the brochure.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Chairman, I will read some parts of this into the record. It reads, "Beautiful Grace Ranch, comprising of: main house, 11 private guest rooms, 2 large sun decks, large dining room, and lounge. Fully equipped restaurant-sized kitchen, store room, modernly equipped laundry, and linen room. Help's quarters. Three large dirt reservoirs, five wells, new aluminum 20 by 50 hay barn, fully equipped work shop, corrals, stables, tack room, one-fourth mile fenced-in exercise track. Plenty of well irrigated land for pasture." As the record will show, there are various photographs showing guest rooms, dining rooms at the main house of the patio and I will ask how much did you pay for this?

Mr. LICAVOLI. It is for sale—you forgot that.

Mr. BURLING. Did you have this printed, Mr. Licavoli?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it being offered for sale for, that is for what amount?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Well, it is—I refuse to answer on the ground it may incriminate me.

Mr. BURLING. The question is a proper question.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman directs you to answer. Do you still refuse?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, I refuse.

Mr. HALLEY. Mr. Chairman, may the record show even the witness laughed at his own answer. Do you take that answer seriously, Mr. Licavoli, that you refuse to answer on the ground it might incriminate you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. BURLING. Do you care to give the committee any explanation as to how the asking price for the piece of real estate could possibly incriminate you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the next question?

Mr. BURLING. How much did you pay for the ranch?

Mr. LICAVOLI. \$21,000.

Mr. BURLING. \$21,000 for this ranch?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. Did you add anything to it?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. How much capital have you put into it?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Oh, \$20,000 or \$25,000.

Mr. BURLING. So your total investment in this ranch which has 75 acres with 11 private guest rooms is in the neighborhood of \$45,000 or \$50,000?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Approximately. I worked on that myself.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a photograph of a house which I would like to show the witness and then have marked. Will you examine that house and see if you know the house, that is examine the photograph?

- Mr. LICAVOLI. That is my house.
- Mr. BURLING. Your house in Grosse Pointe?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.
- Mr. BURLING. How much did you pay for that?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Around \$20,000.
- Mr. BURLING. Did you pay around \$20,000 for that house?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. BURLING. When?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Oh, 10 years ago—11 years ago.
- Mr. BURLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask that that be received in evidence.
- The CHAIRMAN. It will be placed in the record and so marked by the reporter.
- (The document identified was thereupon received in evidence as exhibit No. 4B, Witness Licavoli.)
- Mr. BURLING. You have a brother "Yonnie"? Will you spell the name, please?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir. T-h-o-m-a-s, Thomas.
- Mr. BURLING. How is he commonly known?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Well, the nickname is "Yonnie." His name is Thomas Licavoli.
- Mr. BURLING. Where is he now?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. He is in the Ohio Penitentiary.
- Mr. BURLING. How long has he been there?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. About 17 years.
- Mr. BURLING. He is in for life?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. BURLING. On what charge?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Murder—conspiracy.
- Mr. BURLING. Conspiracy to murder?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes. The same sentence here is 5 years—it calls for 5 years, and in Ohio it is life.
- Mr. BURLING. Now, you have a telephone, I believe, at the Grace ranch?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. BURLING. The telephone records show you made in 1949 and 1950 various phone calls. I am going to ask you to identify the people that you called from there. Did you call a Mr. Connel at [REDACTED], Detroit, and who is he?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me.
- Mr. BURLING. Are you asserting your associations with Mr. Connel would incriminate you?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me.
- Mr. BURLING. Michael Polizzi, [REDACTED], Detroit; who is Michael Polizzi?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me.
- Mr. BURLING. Grace Bommarito, [REDACTED], Detroit, who is she?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Grace Bommarito?
- Mr. BURLING. Do you know anyone named Grace Bommarito?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. My mother-in-law.
- Mr. BURLING. That does not incriminate you.
- Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.
- Mr. BURLING. How about Joseph Bommarito, [REDACTED] ?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. That is my brother-in-law.
- Mr. BURLING. Sam Perrone, [REDACTED]. Who is he?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Next door neighbor.
- Mr. BURLING. An old friend?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.
- Mr. BURLING. A close friend?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir; an acquaintance.
- Mr. BURLING. How long have you known Sam Perrone?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Since he moved.
- Mr. BURLING. When did he move there?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know, I don't remember.
- Mr. BURLING. Well, approximately.
- Mr. LICAVOLI. A couple of years.
- Mr. BURLING. You have been in his house?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.
- Mr. BURLING. He has been in yours?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.
- Mr. BURLING. Donald J. Licavoli, [REDACTED].
- Mr. LICAVOLI. My brother.
- Mr. BURLING. Sam Zerilli, [REDACTED]. Who is he?
- Mr. LICAVOLI. Lorraine?



Mr. BURLING. Sam Zerilli.  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. My brother-in-law.  
 Mr. BURLING. How is he related to you?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. My wife and his wife are sisters.  
 Mr. BURLING. Thomas Licavoli, [REDACTED]. Who is he?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. My brother. It is my sister-in-law, Mrs. Thomas Licavoli.  
 Mr. BURLING. Martin Fenster in Los Angeles, [REDACTED]. Who is he?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. A friend of mine.  
 Mr. BURLING. Maurice alias Mushy Webster, [REDACTED], Cleveland. Who is he?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I know him; a friend of mine.  
 Mr. BURLING. What does he do for a living?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. He has a cafe in Cleveland.  
 Mr. BURLING. Do you have any other people that you know of?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. Not that I know of.  
 Mr. BURLING. He never told you he had any other business except running a cafe?  
 (No response.)  
 Mr. BURLING. In the Desert Inn in Las Vegas, Nev., did you have any business connections—  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.  
 Mr. BURLING. Have you ever been there?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes; a few days ago.  
 Mr. BURLING. Then we have Moe Dalitz. Have you ever heard of him?  
 Las Vegas 6000. Incidentally, that is the number of the Desert Inn.  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I know of him; yes.  
 Mr. BURLING. You telephoned to him; did you not?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. No.  
 Mr. BURLING. You deny having put through a call to Moe Dalitz?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.  
 Mr. BURLING. Then we have Dominick Licavoli, at [REDACTED], at St. Louis.  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. He is my uncle.  
 Mr. BURLING. Frank Valenti, at [REDACTED], in Rochester.  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't remember that.  
 Mr. BURLING. Then we have Pete Mannelli, at [REDACTED]. Do you know him?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know him.  
 Mr. BURLING. You called him, but you don't know him?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I didn't call him. I don't remember.  
 Mr. BURLING. How about Joe DeCarlo, at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, I knew him.  
 Mr. BURLING. What does Joe DeCarlo do?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know.  
 Mr. BURLING. Next we have Mike D'Angelo, at [REDACTED], in Colorado Springs, Colo.  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. Colorado Springs, Colo?  
 Mr. BURLING. Yes, Mike D'Angelo.  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I know a Mike D'Angelo, but he is not from Colorado.  
 Mr. BURLING. Who is he?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. A friend of mine.  
 Mr. BURLING. What does he do for a living?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know.  
 Mr. BURLING. James Brink, [REDACTED], at Erlanger, Ky., do you know him?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.  
 Mr. BURLING. What does he do for a living?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. He runs the Lookout House.  
 Mr. BURLING. Is it a gambling casino?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. The Lookout Stud. It is a stable.  
 Mr. BURLING. You first said "Lookout House," yourself, did you not?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, I did.  
 Mr. BURLING. Was that a slip of the tongue?  
 Mr. LICAVOLI. I made a mistake. It is Lookout Stud.  
 Mr. BURLING. Do you seriously want to tell this committee that the Lookout House or Lookout is not a gambling casino in Kentucky?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know whether it is or not. I have never been in there in my life.

Mr. BURLING. Next is Jack Dillon, [REDACTED], in St. Louis. Who is he?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't remember making any calls to Mr. Dillon.

Mr. BURLING. Next is Sam Masseri, [REDACTED], at San Diego.

Mr. LICAVOLI. He is a cousin of mine.

Mr. BURLING. Then we have Martin Fenster. He is a friend of yours, you say?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. What does he do for a living?

Mr. LICAVOLI. He has a bar in Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. BURLING. Have you ever done time?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you answer audibly so that the reporter can get the answer?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. BURLING. What was the charge?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Bribery of a customs officer.

Mr. BURLING. Where did the alleged bribery take place?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't remember.

Mr. BURLING. Who were you asserted to have bribed, do you remember that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't remember.

Mr. BURLING. Who were you asserted to bribe? Do you remember that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Pardon me?

Mr. BURLING. Who was it said you bribed?

Mr. LICAVOLI. A customs officer.

Mr. BURLING. You do not remember where in the United States?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. BURLING. Where did you serve the time?

Mr. LICAVOLI. In Leavenworth.

Mr. BURLING. Do you know Joe Massei?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. Do you know a man called Melford Jones?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Have you ever been in the Stork Club?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Not that I can remember.

Mr. BURLING. Did you shoot Melford Jones in the Stork Club?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer.

Mr. BURLING. I want to be sure you understood my question. I asked you, Did you shoot Melford Jones in the Stork Club?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Just a moment ago you refused to answer, on the ground that the answer would tend to incriminate you.

Mr. LICAVOLI. If you want me to put it that way, all right. You asked me if I shot Melford Jones, and I said no.

Mr. BURLING. Did you shoot him anywhere not confined to the Stock Club?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a booklet called Green Sheet 1951 Almanac, and I will show it to the witness and ask him if it is not true that he arranged to have it printed and that he distributes these booklets.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer it, on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. In view of that question, I request that the book be received in evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. The booklet will be offered in evidence, admitted, and will be so marked by the official stenographer.

(The document identified was thereupon received in evidence as exhibit 5, Witness Licavoli.)

Mr. BURLING. My understanding of the law is that possession of gambling paraphernalia, including these books, is a violation of State law but there is no Federal law against numbers, which these books are used in connection with. I, therefore, respectfully request that you order the witness to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. It is so ordered, and you are directed to answer.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me, in violation of both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. I show you now a green book for 1950, and ask you if you arranged to have that printed.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the same ground. It may tend to incriminate me in both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Do you know a man named Jerry Martin?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. He hauled these books——

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the ground——

Mr. BURLING. Wait a minute. You have already answered the question.

Mr. LICAVOLI. You asked me if he hauled books.

Mr. BURLING. You are anticipating me. You have correctly guessed the question. Now, Martin hauled the books away from the printer; isn't that right?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me, both in State and Federal laws.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with the book that has been offered in evidence, to ascertain whether you have any explanation to make of it, I have just picked at random on page 16 a series of statements under the month of July, headed "Monthly suggestions." It says: "Here are some hot numbers for the hot days of July: 318, 620, 074, 982."

"If you are planning a vacation, these numbers will help you to finance your trip: 501, 610, 442.

"Around the beginning of the month, watch for numbers 778, 452, and 910.

"In July we start the last half of the year. Start it right with 513, 018, and 539.

"Our extra special favorite number for July is 732.

"Doubles good to follow are 440 and 737.

"927 and 184 are best suggestions for July in the late races and in the first 10 days of the month and 320 and 726 in the early races."

Is there anything further you care to say in regard to that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. BURLING. Are you related to Sam Bommarito?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Joe Bommarito.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Chairman, I am going to show the witness two police records of two different men, named Joe Bommarito, and ask the witness if he can tell which is which. There are two Joes. One is Scarface, and what is the other one's name?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Joe Bommarito.

Mr. BURLING. They are both Joe. One is identified as Scarface, and the other is——

Mr. LICAVOLI. Long Joe Bommarito.

Mr. BURLING. I will show you this and ask you whether that is Long Joe or Scarface.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to identify the records. I refuse to identify any records.

Mr. BURLING. In order to lay a formal foundation for a possible contempt citation, Mr. Chairman, I ask that a photograph and a police record of someone named Joe Bommarito be marked as an exhibit.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. It will be marked and will be designated as No. 6. Will you be good enough to mark it, please, and then let the witness see it?

(The document identified was thereupon received in evidence as exhibit No. 6, Witness Licavoli.)

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to identify any records.

The CHAIRMAN. The question asked of the witness pertains to exhibit No. 6.

Mr. BURLING. It includes a police photograph, Detroit police photograph No. 37496. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the witness may properly be asked to identify a photograph of an alleged hoodlum, especially since he is confused as to which Joe Bommarito is which. I think it is pertinent for us to inquire into that.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you first show him the other one, so he can be asked the question in connection with both?

Mr. BURLING. Then may I ask that a second police record of one Joseph Bommarito, be marked "Exhibit No. 7."

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

(The document identified was thereupon received in evidence as exhibit No. 7, Witness Licavoli.)

Mr. BURLING. Will you look——

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer——

Mr. BURLING. Let me finish my question.

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. Refrain, please, from interrupting any questions until I ask you them. I want to lay a proper foundation. We are not asking you anything

about any activity which you may have had with either of these men. We are merely asking you to examine these two police records, one of which has a photograph attached to it with a number which corresponds to the number of the criminal record involved, and we want to know whether the man in the photograph is Scarface or Long Joe. Will you answer that question?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to identify any photographs or any records, on the ground that it may tend to incriminate me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair directs you to answer. Is it our understanding that the response is the same?

Mr. LICAVOLI. The same; yes.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Licavoli, I notice that in your income-tax return for 1948 you report an item called speculations, \$49,000. I wonder if you would care to tell us just what those speculations were.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me, in violation of both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Are you willing to tell us whether your brother-in-law is Long Joe or Scarface Bommarito?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Long Joe is my brother-in-law.

Mr. BURLING. You keep no records of your financial transactions, I believe?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me, in violation of both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Did you tell that to Mr. Amis on January 19, 1951?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I didn't have no records.

Mr. BURLING. You have no bank accounts, either; is that right?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer that, on the same grounds; it may tend to incriminate me, in both the State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. You did tell that to Mr. Amis, though, didn't you, even though you won't tell us under oath?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer that, on the same grounds.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever hear of the Mexico Villa House?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. You don't deny that that is a numbers house, do you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING all right. Who is Abe Balaban?

(No response.)

Mr. BURLING. You never heard of him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever hear of the Gold Seal Liquor Co. at Chicago?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I have heard of that; yes.

Mr. BURLING. What is your business with them?

Mr. LICAVOLI. None whatsoever.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever hear of the Willow Run Cleaners, located at 13164 Woodrow Wilson?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. You were in it, were you, as a partner?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. And Scarface Bommarito was in it?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Joe Bommarito.

Mr. BURLING. I can't tell which Bommarito is which if I don't use the nickname.

Mr. LICAVOLI. The name is Joe.

Mr. BURLING. They are both Joe, aren't they?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know where you get Scarface.

Mr. BURLING. How do you distinguish one Joe from the other?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Well, the name tells.

Mr. BURLING. You mean they are both Joe, but you can tell them apart by name? I don't understand that. Will you explain that?

(No response.)

Mr. BURLING. What is the Chesterfield House?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me, under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Isn't it the fact that that is the principal numbers house here in Detroit?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me, in violation of both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Are you the top man in the Chesterfield House?



Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Who is Mike Rubino, if you know?

Mr. LICAVOLI. A friend of mine.

Mr. BURLING. Would it be fair to describe him as one of your lieutenants?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds it may tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. Who is Angelo Meli?

Mr. LICAVOLI. A friend of mine.

Mr. BURLING. What does he do for a living, if you know?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever hear he is in the jukebox racket?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know his business.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever ask him what business he was in?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever hear of the Bay Reeves Apartments in Miami, Fla.?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever buy an apartment building in Miami?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever have any interest in real property in Miami?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. I think, in fairness to the witness, I should say that this piece of paper is misfiled. There is no reason to suppose he did.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. BURLING. Now, how about the Ficceti brothers? Are they friends of yours?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know them.

Mr. BURLING. You never met them?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. BURLING. How about Joe Adonis? Do you know him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever hear of him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir. Only what I read in the papers.

Mr. BURLING. Until Adonis' name was in the papers recently, you never heard of him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Do you know Harry Bennett?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. You never met him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Didn't you recruit hoodlums for him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever recruit anybody, whether or not he was a hoodlum?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Do you deny that you recruited a squad of men—

Mr. LICAVOLI. I deny it; yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Licavoli, please wait until I finish the question. Did you not recruit a squad of men that were stationed in the Ford Motor Co.'s firehouse to work in the service department?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I did not.

Mr. BURLING. You did not?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. BURLING. Is it not true that thereafter they were discharged by Bennett?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know nothing about it.

Mr. BURLING. You don't know nothing about that?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Is it not true that following that, you said that you wished to see Bennett, and Bennett wouldn't see you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No. I don't know anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer audibly, please.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know anything about that.

Mr. BURLING. Didn't you force his car off the road in order to force him to talk to you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Absolutely not.

Mr. BURLING. Wasn't there a feud between you and Bennett?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir. I don't even know the man. Never had no business dealings with him.

Mr. BURLING. Is it or is it not the fact that Bennett sent to New York for a Mafia leader to come out and adjudicate the dispute?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. BURLING. You have never heard of the Mafia?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. When did you first hear the word "Mafia" used?

Mr. LICAVOLI. In the newspapers.

Mr. BURLING. What year?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Lately, recently.

Mr. BURLING. As a boy, you never heard the word "Mafia" used at all?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. BURLING. How old are you, sir?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Forty-eight.

Mr. BURLING. Let's say up until you were 47 years old, you had never heard the word used?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Who is Angelo Lafata?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know Lafata.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Chairman, I am going to show the witness a picture attached to a police record, and ask the witness if he knows who the man in the picture is.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know him.

Mr. BURLING. Who is Frank Camarata?

Mr. LICAVOLI. My brother-in-law.

Mr. BURLING. Tell us how you are related to him.

Mr. LICAVOLI. He is married to my sister.

Mr. BURLING. You have a sister named Grace, and also a wife named Grace?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. And he was convicted in Canada of a felony, was he not?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. And after that he came to this country and got a sentence of 15 to 30 years; is that correct?

Mr. LICAVOLI. That is right.

Mr. BURLING. And that was commuted on the condition that he depart to Italy; is that correct?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know the condition, sir. I know he was deported to Italy.

Mr. BURLING. You know that he didn't serve out the prison term, don't you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes; I know that.

Mr. BURLING. Did you ever hear that a condition of his parole was that he be forthwith deported?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Deported to Italy; yes, sir.

Mr. BURLING. And then he illegally reentered the country; is that right?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know if he illegally reentered. I couldn't answer that question.

Mr. BURLING. When you saw him, how did he tell you he had gotten back in after he had been deported?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I didn't see him until long after he was arrested.

Mr. BURLING. Didn't the FBI pick him up at your house in Grosse Pointe once?

Mr. LICAVOLI. After he was arrested in Ohio; yes.

Mr. BURLING. Yes, but he was at your house.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I wasn't there.

Mr. BURLING. But he was in your house when he was once picked up; is that right?

Mr. LICAVOLI. That's after he was arrested in Ohio, when the immigration—

Mr. BURLING. But he was in your house. You knew he was deported, and then you saw him in your house, didn't you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No; I saw him afterward, after he was arrested.

Mr. BURLING. What does Mr. Cammarata do for a living?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know, sir.

Mr. BURLING. What kind of political influence do you have, Mr. Licavoli, if you can get a Congressman to introduce a special bill to stay the deportation of Mr. Cammarata after he had been convicted of two felonies and deported and then reentered the country illegally?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know anything about it.

Mr. BURLING. Don't you know a bill was introduced?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Mr. Chairman, at this point I ask leave to introduce H. R. 6286 of the Eightieth Congress, second session, a bill of relief of Francesco Cammarata. The CHAIRMAN. It will be marked and offered in evidence as exhibit No. 8. (The document identified was thereupon received in evidence as "Exhibit 8, Witness Licavoli".)

Mr. BURLING. Has Mr. Cammarata got any other powerful connections except you?

Mr. LICAVOLI. He hasn't got me. I have no part in it.

Mr. BURLING. Do you know Senator Capehart?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Do I know him?

Mr. BURLING. Yes.

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. Didn't you ask Senator Capehart to intervene in behalf of your brother-in-law?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to introduce into the record and to read a photostat of a telegram addressed to Frank Cammarata, 236 Meadowbrook, Warren, Ohio. It is dated June 25, 1948:

"Immigration just approved 90 days stay. New York office being notified by teletype. Unnecessary you appear there Monday. Writer may be necessary your bond. Proper authorities will advise you.

"RAY A. DONALDSON,

*"Administrative Assistant to Senator Capehart."*

I will ask you again: Did you ask Senator Capehart to intervene?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Do you know Congressman Curwin?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. Do you know or have any idea why he intervened in this matter?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Is it your testimony that you did not at any time talk to anybody about having the deportation of Mr. Cammarata stayed?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Absolutely not.

Mr. HALLEY. You never had any discussion about it with anyone?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Not with Mr. Cammarata?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Mr. Cammarata, I talked to him, but I don't know what he has done, or anybody else has done. I have had no connections or talked with anybody.

Mr. HALLEY. Did you suggest to Mr. Cammarata that he take any steps whatsoever?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. You did not talk to anyone else at all about Mr. Cammarata's deportation?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know Al Polesi?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. How long have you known him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Twenty years, twenty-five years.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever had any business relations with him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know Frank Milano?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I know of him.

Mr. HALLEY. You have never met him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know Tony or Anthony Milano?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. You never met him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know Doc Mangene?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Are you related to him directly or indirectly?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. HALLEY. How long have you known him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. A few years, 5 or 6 years.

Mr. HALLEY. Who is James Licavoli?

Mr. LICAVOLI. He is my cousin.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know whether or not James Licavoli recently was paroled from a penitentiary?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. HALLEY. In Ohio.

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you not know that Doc Mangene and James Licavoli lived together after Licavoli was released?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know.

Mr. HALLEY. When did you last see Doc Mangene?

Mr. LICAVOLI. A few years back.

Mr. HALLEY. What is the nature of your relationship with Doc Mangene?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Just hello; an acquaintance.

Mr. HALLEY. Who introduced you to him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I forget now, and don't remember.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know anybody by the name of Thompson?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. HALLEY. In the building business.

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know anybody by the name of Thompson who went on James Licavoli's parole with an offer of a job for him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know whether or not James Licavoli actually went to work for Vincent Mangene when he got out of prison?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know where Vincent Mangene is now?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you not know that Mangene and Thompson are now in business with Al Polesi in Florida?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No; I don't.

Mr. HALLEY. When did you last see Al Polesi?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I haven't seen him in 3 or 4 years.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know Willie Morretti?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. He may be known to you as Willie Moore.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know him.

Mr. HALLEY. Did he ever visit you at your ranch in Tucson?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know Tony Gizzo?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. He lives in Kansas City.

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. You do not know him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Did Joe Massei ever visit you at your ranch?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. At no time?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know John King, sometimes known as John Angasola?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes; I know him.

Mr. HALLEY. How long have you known him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. About 20 years.

Mr. HALLEY. He lives in Cleveland; is that right?

Mr. LICAVOLI. In Florida, I believe.

Mr. HALLEY. Now he lives in Florida, but comes from Cleveland; is that right?

Mr. LICAVOLI. That's right.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever had any business with him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Where did you meet him? Under what circumstances?

Mr. LICAVOLI. In Cleveland.

Mr. HALLEY. Did you ever work or have business in Cleveland?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. What brought you to Cleveland?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Just a visit.

Mr. HALLEY. Whom did you visit in Cleveland?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Friend of mine. I forget now, it was so long ago.

Mr. HALLEY. Was Al Polesi one of the friends you visited?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't recall, Mr. Halley.



Mr. HALLEY. Did you ever visit any of the King boys in Cleveland? John King?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Johnny King; yes.

Mr. HALLEY. You did visit them?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. HALLEY. What is your business?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me both under State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you have any legitimate business?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever had a legitimate business?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the ground that it will tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever had a legitimate business?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. HALLEY. What was the last legitimate business you had?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may tend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you had a legitimate business within the last 5 years?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may intend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. Did you operate your ranch as a business?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Just as a residence?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. Then you did not operate it as a business? That is your testimony? You did not operate the ranch as a business?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I have certain sections of it—

Mr. BURLING. Did you or did you not?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I have certain sections of it operating as a horse ranch as a business. But on my private residence there is no business, just a private ranch.

Mr. BURLING. But you take deductions for the loss of the operations of the ranch on your income tax?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Just the horses.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know Mickey Cohen?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Did he ever visit you at your ranch?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Do you know little Augie Pisano?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever been in Florida?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. HALLEY. In Miami or Miami Beach?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Miami Beach.

Mr. HALLEY. When were you last there?

Mr. LICAVOLI. 1928 or 1929.

Mr. HALLEY. Where did you stay there?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I forget the cottage in Hollywood.

Mr. HALLEY. You rented it?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. HALLEY. Did you ever own a home in Florida?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. You have not been to Florida since 1929?

Mr. LICAVOLI. In 1928 or something like that. I can't remember.

Mr. HALLEY. Since 1929, have you had a legitimate business of any kind?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the ground that it may intend to incriminate me both under State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. I am talking about a legitimate business.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the ground that it may intend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. You have income from some source, do you not?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may intend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. Did you pay income taxes last year?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. Then you must have had income to pay a tax on.

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. HALLEY. Was that income based on any legitimate source?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer.

Mr. HALLEY. I am not asking about anything illegitimate, and I am just asking you to name any legitimate source.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may intend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. HALLEY. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair directs that you answer the last question.

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may intend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. I have just one or two more questions.

In 1949, you returned in your income-tax return an even \$42,000 for speculations. I do not want to know if that amount is correct, but just want to know, how can you speculate so as to come out to a flat \$42,000 and not odd numbers?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer, on the grounds that it may intend to incriminate me under both State and Federal laws.

Mr. BURLING. I suppose you won't tell us what the speculations were?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I refuse to answer.

Mr. BURLING. Do you know Pete Corrado?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes.

Mr. BURLING. How well do you know him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Just an acquaintance, to say "Hello."

Mr. BURLING. Where is he?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I don't know.

Mr. BURLING. Neither do I. Did you ever hear him referred to as the "Enforcer"?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. He is your "enforcer," isn't he?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. BURLING. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, that concludes the interrogation by counsel. I now desire to make an announcement. A series of questions were asked of you by counsel which appeared to the committee to be proper questions of interrogation, and are such that you have no right to refuse to answer on the grounds that they may tend to incriminate you for a Federal offense.

I want, first of all, to ask if you desire to modify your position and to answer any of the questions, or whether you persist in your refusal to answer?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. That being so, it is incumbent upon this committee, because it is our opinion that the questions are proper questions and should be answered by you, to state to you that it will be recommended to the full committee that a citation for contempt be issued against you.

You are excused.

Mr. HALLEY. May I just ask one question again, because I want to be sure the witness understood it.

You say you do not know Willie Morretti?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. HALLEY. Who is sometimes known as Willie Moore?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No.

Mr. HALLEY. Have you ever heard of him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. I have heard of him.

Mr. HALLEY. He comes from New Jersey?

Mr. LICAVOLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. You do not know him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. You never met him?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

Mr. HALLEY. He never visited your ranch?

Mr. LICAVOLI. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness is excused.

(Witness excused.)

## ANNEX II

The committee has received the following memorandum from its associate counsel, which sets forth the legal opinion of its staff with reference to the contempts committed by Pete Licavoli.

FEBRUARY 17, 1951.

Memorandum to Senator Estes Kefauver, chairman, Re Contempt of Pete Licavoli (S. Res. 79):

I have examined the record of the testimony of Pete Licavoli in addition to hearing it at the time it was given, and it is my opinion, which has previously been conveyed to the committee, that the refusal by Pete Licavoli to answer questions was contemptuous of the United States Senate and its Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce.

As associate counsel of the committee, with the advice and concurrence of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now certify that the contempts complained of are, in my opinion, punishable as a matter of law. In those instances where the witness asserted a claim of privilege, it is my opinion that the claim was not made in good faith inasmuch as there was no reasonable relationship between the questions asked and a line of proof which might incriminate the witness under any Federal statute.

In certifying contempt proceedings, this committee and its counsel have carefully distinguished between refusals to answer based on an arbitrary or fanciful claim of privilege from refusals to answer questions where a claim of privilege might be raised with even a minimum possibility that the witness might be incriminated under any of the laws of the United States.

JOHN L. BURLING, *Associate Counsel.*

○

## EXHIBIT II

The committee has received the following information from its sources, which sets forth the basic opinion of its staff with reference to the contents transmitted by Ruth Lucas:

February 17, 1951  
Memorandum to Senator James Eastland, Chairman, The Committee on Labor and Human Resources

I have examined the record of the testimony of Ruth Lucas in addition to having it at the time it was given and it is my opinion that the material presented by her to the committee, and the refusal by Ruth Lucas to answer questions was consistent with the United States and its Senate Committee to Investigate Organized Crime in America.

As a source of much of the committee with the advice and cooperation of the committee's legal staff, I have advised the committee and now advise that the committee is convinced of the truth of the material presented by her. In these instances where the witness has refused to answer questions, it is my opinion that the truth was not in good faith because as there was no possibility of relationship between the questions asked and a line of proof which might have been established by the committee.

In my view, therefore, the committee and the Senate have established that the material presented by her was not in good faith or lawful claim of privilege from refusal to answer questions which is a claim of privilege might be raised which even a statute occasionally forbids witness to refuse to answer under any of the laws of the United States.

John A. Burnett, Associate Counsel

○